



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,910	03/03/2004	Duane A. Burnett	CV06025US01	3844
24265	7590	08/03/2006	EXAMINER BERCH, MARK L	
SCHERING-PLOUGH CORPORATION PATENT DEPARTMENT (K-6-1, 1990) 2000 GALLOPING HILL ROAD KENILWORTH, NJ 07033-0530			ART UNIT 1624	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/791,910	BURNETT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark L. Berch	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 12-18, 20-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) .
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

The traverse is unpersuasive. Applicants argue on lack of burden. The burden is seen in the additional search in additional classes. When G is sugar residue, the subject matter is classified in class 536, subclass 29.11. When G is oligopeptide, , it is classified in class 930, subclass 280. Claims 1-9, 12-18, 20-23 are rejected as being drawn to an improper Markush Group. The claims are drawn to multiple inventions for reasons set forth in the above requirement for restriction. This does not constitute an art recognized genus. The claims are examined only to the extent that they read on the elected invention. Cancellation of the non-elected subject matter will overcome the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-18, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The provision for dioxolanyl being substituted (see third from last line of claim 1) lacks description in the specification. Note page 21, line 3, which makes no provision for this being substituted.

Claims 1-9, 12-18, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraphs 1 and 2, as the claimed invention is not described, or is not described in such full, clear, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same, and/or failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. Specifically:

The molecule when G is an trialkylammoniumalkyl choice has a plus charge but no minus charge. A molecule without electrical neutrality is impossible to prepare and hence lacks enablement in terms of how to make, as such a thing cannot be made (paragraph 1). Note MPEP §2172.01: “A claim which omits matter disclosed to be essential to the invention as described in the specification or in other statements of record may be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not enabling. *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). See also MPEP §2164.08(c). Such essential matter may include missing elements ...”. Here, the missing counterion is the missing element. On the other hand, if it was not the intention of applicants to claim such a non-neutral molecule, then the claim fails to set forth what applicants intend as their invention (paragraph 2). That is, it is not accurate because it is missing something. As stated in *In re Zletz*, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322, “An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct and unambiguous.”

Applicants need to locate the description of the counterion in the specification, and include that in claim 1.

The traverse is unpersuasive. Applicants point to the generic salt language on page 24, line 28-page 25, line 9. Note that one prepares a salt of an acid (e.g. the COOH) or a salt of a base (such as an amino group), not a salt of a cation. That is, one forms a salt by reacting the parent acid with a base (so as to exchange the proton of the acid with the cation of the base), or the parent base with an acid, so as to protonate the amine and form the ammonium salt, as is set forth in the specification. Thus, converting a compound into a salt (e.g. RCOOH is converted to RCOOK) does not alter the electrical neutrality or lack thereof of the original compound. In such a process, if R had a charge on it, it will still have a charge on it after the salt thereof has been formed. In this case, it simply appears that the specification forgot to provide a generic description for the counterion.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Treatment of such disorders in general cannot be deemed enabled.

Pursuant to *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988), one considers the following factors to determine whether undue experimentation is required: (A) The breadth of the claims; (B) The nature of the invention; (C) The state of the prior art; (D) The level of one of ordinary skill; (E) The level of predictability in the art; (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor; (G) The existence of working examples; and (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. Some experimentation is not fatal; the issue is whether the amount of experimentation is "undue"; see *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1444. The analysis is as follows:

Art Unit: 1624

(1) Breadth of claims.

(a) Scope of the compounds. Because of the huge scope of the many primary variables, trillions of compounds are embraced

(b) Scope of the diseases covered. There are quite a range of disorders.

A. Treating demylenation would involve treating demyelinating diseases in two broad categories. Primary demyelination is a loss of myelin sheaths with relative preservation of the demyelinated axons, arising either from damage to the oligodendroglia from a direct attack on the myelin itself. Secondary demyelination, occurs following axonal degeneration. For example, Leukodystrophies are diseases of the white matter resulting from an error in the myelin metabolism, giving impaired myelin formation. Each involves the deficiency of a different enzyme. Examples include Krabbe's disease, Adrenoleukodystrophy (which exists in 4 forms), adrenomyeloneuropathy, Alexander Disease, Canavan Disease, Metachromatic Leukodystrophy (which exists in three forms), Pelizaeus-Merzbacher Disease, Refsum Disease, and Zellweger Syndrome. No pharmaceutical treatment is available to any of the leukodystrophies. Acute Necrotizing Hemorrhagic Leukoencephalitis is believed to be mediated by autoimmune attack on CNS myelin, triggered by a viral infection. It is usually fatal, generally just within days on onset. Other examples include Multiple Sclerosis (MS), progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy, and Acute Disseminated Encephalomyelitis. Some are inherited diseases, such as peroneal muscular atrophy, hypertrophic polyneuropathy and Refsum's disease.

B. Regulating levels of β -amyloid peptides. More than a dozen of these have been found so far. The claim would thus cover "regulating" all of these.

Art Unit: 1624

C. Diabetes mellitus covers Type I, which is an autoimmune disorder. It also covers Type 2 diabetes mellitus, maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY, which comes in 6 completely different forms arising from different genetic defects), Gestational diabetes mellitus ("GD") and neonatal diabetes, which also arises from a specific genetic defect; these are metabolic disorders.

G. The claims also cover an assortment of other diseases, including Alzheimer's Disease, and treatment and prevention of obesity and stroke.

(2) The nature of the invention and predictability in the art: The invention is directed toward medicine and is therefore physiological in nature. It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved," and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor.

See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

(3) Direction or Guidance: That provided is very limited. The dosage range information on page 31 is in the form of mg, not mg/kg. Further it is completely generic, with the same dosage regardless of disorder involved.

(4) State of the Prior Art: The compounds are azetidinones with a particular substitution pattern at several positions. So far as the examiner is aware, azetidinones have not been used for many items on this list, such as any form of diabetes, for Alzheimer's Disease, for any of the Leukodystrophies or Multiple Sclerosis, for stroke, etc.

(5) Working Examples: There are none at all. No data of any kind is presented.

(6) Skill of those in the art: The skill level for Alzheimer's Disease is considered low. Alzheimer's Disease is an extraordinarily difficult disease to treat, and has been the subject of a vast amount of research. Despite an enormous number of different approaches, the skill level in the art is so low relative to the difficulty of task that the only success has come from treatment by compounds which are Acetylcholinesterase inhibitors (Aricept®, Cognex®, Exelon®, and Reminyl®), or voltage-dependent NMDA-antagonists (Memantine), properties these compounds are not disclosed to have. The skill level for treating assorted demyelination disorders is even lower; most have no treatment for the disorder per se; treatment is limited to palliation of discomfort. Treatment of stroke is particularly difficult, as it involves use of neuroprotective agents, a property these compounds are not disclosed to have.

(7) The quantity of experimentation needed: Owing especially to factors (1), (5) and (6), the quantity of experimentation is expected to be high.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here.

Claim Objections

Claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Specification

The abstract is objected to as vague. It gives too little of a description of the invented material.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark L. Berch whose telephone number is 571-272-0663. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 - 3:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on (571)272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mark L. Berch
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

8/1/2006